DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 161 998 UD 018 692

AUTHOR	Crocker, Stephen; Sperlich, Peter W.
TITLE	An Evaluation of the Emergency School Aid Act Nonprofit Organization: Vol. II, A Description of Local Program Operations.
INSTITUTION	Rand Corp., Santa Monica, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation.
REPORT NO	R-2312/2-HEW
PUB DATE	Jun 78
CONTRACT	300-76-0311
NOTE	56p.
AVAILABLE FROM	The Rand Corporation, 1700 Main Street, Santa Monica, California 90406 ($3.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Change Agents; Change Strategies; Community Involvement; Community Programs; *Educational Programs; *Educational Strategies; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Programs; Government School Relationship; *Nonprofit Organizations; *Organizational Development; School District Autonomy; *School Integration
IDENTIFIERS	*Emergency School Aid Act

ABSTRACT

This report describes the following aspects of the non-profit organization (NPO) program of the Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA): (1) the demographic characteristics of NPOs; (2) the types of organizations funded under ESAA-NPO programs; (3) the function of the formal NPO advisory committee compared with school district or community participation in NPO operations; (4) the activities most or least often undertaken by NPOs and the conditions associated with undertaking some types of activities rather than others; (5) the relationship between activities undertaken by NPOs and the desegregation phase of the district; and (6) the extent NPOs operates as organizations promoting change in district policies or adversary organizations and the conditions associated with NPOs acting as change agents. In addition, major findings and areas for policy recommendations are discussed. Appended is a brief description of the questionnaire that provides the data for this report. (Author/EB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED161998

AN EVALUATION OF THE EMERGENCY SCHOOL AID ACT NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION: VOL. II, A DESCRIPTION OF LOCAL PROGRAM OPERATIONS

PREPARED FOR THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

STEPHEN CROCKER AND PETER W. SPERLICH
WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF LONNA P. OLIVER

R-2312/2-HEW
JUNE 1978

$3.00

UD018692

Rand
SANTA MONICA, CA. 90406

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PREFACE

The Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) of 1972 authorizes grants or contracts to any nonprofit organization other than a Local Education Agency to support school desegregation programs or reduce minority group isolation or its effects. The Nonprofit Organization (NPO) program under ESAA is a small component of generalized assistance to school desegregation. NPOs are funded on the assumption that certain activities relating to school desegregation can be effectively performed by organizations outside the regular school district structure.

This report is Vol. II of four volumes representing Rand's evaluation of the NPO program, conducted for the Office of Planning, Budgeting and Evaluation (OPBE) of the U.S. Office of Education under Contract No. 300-76-0311 with Stephen Crocker as Principal Investigator. The main title of all volumes is *An Evaluation of the Emergency School Aid Act Nonprofit Organization Program.*

Vol. I, An Analysis of Federal Program Implementation and Funding Procedures, J. Kimbrough and J. Hyman, R-2312/1-HEW.

Vol. II, A Description of Local Program Operations, S. Crocker and P. W. Sperlich, R-2312/2-HEW.

Vol. III, The Role of Community Organizations in Facilitating School Desegregation, L. McDonnell and G. Zellman, R-2312/3-HEW.

Vol. IV, Conclusions and Policy Recommendations, S. Crocker and J. Kimbrough, R-2312/4-HEW.

Volume I examines the legislative and programmatic history of the ESAA-NPO program and analyzes the grant awards process for NPOs. Volume II describes NPO activities at the school district level. Volume III compares the effectiveness of ESAA-NPOs and non-ESAA funded groups. Volume IV includes specific policy recommendations.

This volume primarily addresses OPBE, ESAA-NPO personnel, school district personnel associated with the ESAA-NPO program, and education professionals interested in the role of community organizations facilitating school desegregation.

SUMMARY

The Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) of 1972 authorizes grants or contracts to nonprofit organizations to carry out programs to facilitate school desegregation or reduce minority isolation or its effects. Of the annual ESAA appropriation, 8 percent is reserved in the Act for the nonprofit organization (NPO) program. In FY76, there were 215 awards totaling $17.2 million, for an average award size of $80,000 per NPO.

The NPO program is an outgrowth of a similar program funded under the Emergency School Assistance Program (ESAP). Several changes from the ESAP Community Groups program to the ESAA-NPO program gave rise to an interest in the present evaluation: NPOs are required to maintain much closer relationships with the Local Education Agency; NPOs are required to consult with an advisory committee on a regular basis; the ESAP program was targeted to southern school districts undergoing active desegregation during 1970-72, whereas the ESAA program assists districts throughout the nation in various desegregation phases. A description of NPO activities and organization types provides an understanding of how these programs differ at the local level; for example, one working hypothesis is that with the requirement of greater school district cooperation, NPOs are less likely to promote district policy changes.

This report describes the following aspects of this program:

- The types of organizations and activities funded under the ESAA-NPO program and the conditions associated with undertaking some types of activities rather than others.
- The relationship between NPO activities and the desegregation phase of the school district.
- The extent to which NPOs operate as organizations promoting changes in district policy and the associated conditions.
- The function of the NPO Advisory Committee compared with school district or community participation in NPO operations.

The data base for this analysis is a mail questionnaire sent to all FY76 funded NPOs; 81 percent of project directors returned completed questionnaires.

NPOs are predominantly minority group organizations with directors and staff who are long-time area residents. In terms of organizational types, the consortium (coalition of local organizations) is least frequent, probably because of overlapping rather than unique constituencies for desegregation-related activities, which makes local organizations competitive rather than cooperative. Nearly 70 percent of the districts with NPOs are not in any active desegregation phase; they have either completed plan implementation five or more years ago, or have only a minority isolation plan. ESAA-NPO activities are not targeted to districts in active desegregation phases.

The most frequent types of NPO activities are educational services (such as cultural enrichment or remedial services) and community relations (such as school-community liaison activities or information dissemination). Few NPOs monitor school desegregation or plans. There is no apparent relationship between desegregation phase and NPO activities; NPOs undertake the same kinds of activities regardless of the desegregation phase of the district.

The report examines a number of elements associated with undertaking activities of one type rather than another. Although local chapters of national organizations (such as the Urban League) show the greatest tendency to undertake community relations and monitoring activities, most locals are autonomous, so this effect is not strong.

Until recently, U.S. Office of Education (OE) Regional Offices were responsible for both reviewing NPO proposals and providing technical assistance to NPOs. Regional Office participation in NPO operations is associated with NPOs undertaking more educational services and community relations activities; monitoring is probably not encouraged because it can disrupt relationships between OE staff and local school district officials.

At the local level, most influences on NPO operations tend to encourage educational services activities. Greater participation in NPO operations by ESAA basic grant personnel, the ESAA-NPO advisory

committee, or school district administrators is associated with NPOs undertaking more educational services activities. The single exception is greater community participation (active groups or persons outside the school system), which is associated with NPOs undertaking more monitoring activities.

NPOs seldom act as catalysts for change, either by taking an activist posture (seeking to mobilize public support for their position when it conflicts with the school district) or by attempting to influence district policies. The common response to a dispute with the school district is inaction, altering the organization's activities or goals, or seeking a *private* meeting with school district officials.

Greater participation in NPO operations by school district officials is negatively associated with NPOs taking an activist posture. A comparison of ESAA-NPO advisory committee participation and community participation shows that the advisory committee is not functioning to provide real community input. Finally, relating types of activities to NPO activist or influence behavior shows that educational services activities are least likely to be positively associated with such efforts. If it is assumed that NPOs should be promoting policy changes more than they are now, educational services activities should be deemphasized in favor of community relations and monitoring.

In sum, the following may be in need of restructure or revision:

- The present relationship between the school district and the NPO.
- Educational services activities undertaken by NPOs.
- The ESAA-NPO advisory committee.
- The relationship between NPO grants and the desegregation phase of the school district.

Specific recommendations are discussed in Vol. IV.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to express their appreciation to the many people who made valuable contributions to this report. Gary Orfield and Frederick M. Wirt of the University of Illinois served as formal reviewers. Drafts were also reviewed by the National Advisory Committee: Jess Pat Elliot, Joanne Fountain, Winifred Green, Ruby Martin, Muriel Snowden, and Neuman M. Walker. This report was also circulated among principal ESAA-NPO evaluation staff members Robert L. Crain, James B. Hyman, Jackie M. Kimbrough, Lorraine M. McDonnell, and Gail Zellman. Dan Weiler reviewed the document as Deputy Program Manager for the Rand Education Program. The constructive comments of all reviewers improved the volume considerably.

A special thanks is due Robert York, U.S. Office of Education project monitor, for his guidance and endurance. The authors gratefully acknowledge assistance from the staff of the Equal Educational Opportunities Program at the U.S. Office of Education. Finally, the cooperation of individual project directors of ESAA-NPO projects in responding to the mail questionnaire is gratefully acknowledged.

Although this report would not have been possible without the assistance and cooperation of many people, the authors are responsible for any errors that may remain.

CONTENTS

PREFACE iii

SUMMARY v

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ix

TABLES xiii

Section
I. INTRODUCTION 1

II. NPO DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS 6
Racial Composition of Staff 6
Staff Residence 6
Organization Types 7
District Characteristics 7

III. NPO ACTIVITIES 9
Activity Types and Organization Characteristics 14
Activity Types and Regional Office Input 14
Activity Types and Desegregation Status 18
The Role of Participation by Outside Groups on Activity Types 21
Conclusions 25

IV. NPOs AS CHANGE AGENTS 27
The Role of Outside Groups 30
Types of Activities 32
Conclusion 33

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 34

Appendix
A. A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF MAIL QUESTIONNAIRE CONTENTS 39
B. ANALYSIS OF RESPONSE RELIABILITY 43

TABLES

1. Most and Least Frequent Activities of NPOs 10

2. Activity Types and Frequency of Occurrence 12

3. Relationship Between Activities Included in Factors 15

4. Activity Type, by Organization Type 16

5. Activity Type, by Regional Office Input 18

6. Average Number of Activities Undertaken, by Type and Desegregation Phase 20

7. Activity Type, by Participation of Outside Groups 23

8. Effort to Influence Local School, by Policy Area 29

9. Perceived Success, by Policy Area 29

10. Change Agent Behavior, by Participation of Outside Groups in the Organization 31

11. Change Agent Behavior, by Activity Type 32

I. INTRODUCTION

The Emergency School Aid Act (ESAA) of 1972 authorizes grants or contracts to "any public or private nonprofit agency, institution, or organization (other than a local education agency) to carry out programs or projects designed to support the development or implementation of a plan, program or activity,"[1] to facilitate desegregation and to reduce minority group isolation or its effects. The act reserves 8 percent of the ESAA appropriation ($248 million in FY76) for the nonprofit organization (NPO) program. In FY76, there were 215 NPO awards totaling $17.2 million, for an average award of approximately $80,000 per NPO.[2]

The act restricts assistance to school districts that have an accepted plan for desegregation or for the reduction, prevention, or elimination of racial isolation (minority isolation plan); or a plan to establish or maintain one or more integrated schools. The Office for Civil Rights reviews ESAA applications for plan eligibility and civil rights compliance. Unlike ESAA grants to school districts (called "ESAA basic grants"), NPO grants are not tied closely to plan eligibility requirements. Some NPO projects are operating in eligible districts that did not receive basic grants.[3] In addition, NPOs can be funded in districts that are not eligible for basic grants, because the regulations require only that the district request financial assistance under ESAA for development of a plan or project relating to facilitating desegregation or reducing minority isolation.[4]

---

[1] PL 92-318, Title VII, Section 708(b).

[2] Of actual grants in FY76, 97 percent are to nonprofit organizations or agencies rather than such institutions as colleges or universities. A nonprofit organization is defined as one in which "no part of whose net earnings may lawfully inure to the benefit of any private shareholder or individuals." 45 C.F.R. G-185.61(b).

[3] Ten percent of NPO awards in FY76 went to organizations in districts without ESAA basic grants.

[4] 45 C.F.R. G-185.61(d). A recent example is the Los Angeles Unified School District, which was declared ineligible for an ESAA basic grant because of staff segregation, but NPO money was awarded in the district.

NPOs have applied for funding annually through the OE Regional Offices. This procedure has recently been changed, so applications are sent to Washington, D.C. However, the process of application review is the same as described below. Awards are based on the total number of points awarded proposals on two sets of funding criteria--"objective" and "educational and programmatic." The first set (called "statistical criteria") is based on the number and percent of minority group children enrolled in the district and the number and percent of minority group children affected by the desegregation plan (called "reduction of minority group isolation"). The second set (called "quality points") includes a list of elements intended to measure the quality of the applicant's project or program (needs assessment, objectives, activities, resource management and evaluation). Each NPO application receives a total number of points equal to its statistical score plus its point ratings on the quality criteria (as assessed by a nonfederal panel of judges). These scores are ranked from highest to lowest on a state-by-state basis, and NPOs are funded in rank order. The actual number funded in each state depends upon the funds allocated to each state remaining after the higher ranking application is funded; it is possible for only one NPO to be funded in a state if its budget uses the total dollar allotment for the NPO program in that state.[1]

The act and regulations provide for an advisory committee whose function it is to provide community input into the program. Advisory committee members review the proposal before submission and act as consultants during the operational phase of the project.[2]

In addition to a review of the proposal by the advisory committee, the regulations require the Local Education Agency (LEA) to be given at least 15 days before submission of the NPO application in which to offer recommendations to the applicant and submit comments to the OE central office in Washington, D.C. if it desires. The LEA is not required to provide the NPO a copy of any comments forwarded. The application is to include written assurance that this procedure was followed; this provision is commonly known as the "LEA signoff" on the proposal.[3]

---

[1] 45 C.F.R. G-185.63-5. This funding procedure is examined in detail in Vol. I.

[2] 45 C.F.R. G-185.65.

[3] 45 C.F.R. G-175.63.

The NPO program is a direct outgrowth of an earlier program administered under the Emergency School Assistance Program (ESAP). The NPO component (called the Community Groups program) was centrally rather than regionally administered, as was the rest of the ESAP program. It did not include a regional proposal award system, the advisory committee requirement, or direct interaction with the LEA before funding.[1] These and other changes that occurred when ESAP was granted statutory authority as ESAA prompted a number of concerns both within and outside of the program about the nature of the new NPO program; interest developed in understanding and describing NPO program operations.

One of the major issues involved the types of districts in which NPOs were funded. The ESAP program was originally targeted to southern school districts undergoing active desegregation during 1970-72. With the advent of generalized assistance provided under ESAA, and the inclusion of districts with minority isolation plans as well as desegregation plans being eligible for funding, a question arises about the desegregation-related nature of the assistance provided.

Another interest developed in a description of the types of organizations being funded and activities being undertaken in the NPO program. The minority staff composition of NPOs is unknown. Knowledge about activities at a specific level is currently lacking. Comparisons with projects funded under ESAP had no data base.[2]

A difference in the school district interaction component between ESAP and ESAA prompted an inquiry into how much the community organizations funded under ESAA were operating as change agent organizations--organizations facilitating or effecting district policy changes. The additional requirements of school district review of the proposal and other prescribed interactions with district personnel caused concern about whether the NPOs might not at most become extensions of the LEAs, or at least tend not to advocate policies or activities disturbing to the school district.

---

[1] These and other differences are examined in detail in Vol. I.

[2] See Kirschner Associates, Inc., *ESAP Community Group Program*, October 1972; and Barbara Campbell MacPhee, *Emergency School Assistance Program Community Grants*, Southern Education Foundation, November 1971.

Finally, unlike ESAP, the ESAA-NPO program includes an advisory committee requirement for proposal review and consultation, based on the assumptions that community input into the organization maintains a grassroots connection and that the mechanism of an advisory committee provides that function. There is programmatic interest in whether these assumptions are being met.

This report describes the following:

- The types of organizations funded under the ESAA-NPO programs.
- The function of the formal NPO advisory committee compared with school district or community participation in NPO operations.
- The activities most or least often undertaken by NPOs and the conditions associated with undertaking some types of activities rather than others.
- The relationship between activities undertaken by NPOs and the desegregation phase of the district.
- The extent NPOs operate as organizations promoting change in district policies or adversary organizations and the conditions associated with NPOs acting as change agents.

As noted in a 1971 House committee report,[1] ESAA's main purpose was to provide assistance for desegregation, not compensatory education. Because in most cases desegregation is forced on a school district rather than voluntarily undertaken, one role of the community organization in facilitating that process is to monitor the school district's progress along those lines. A second likely role for the community organization is to assist in carrying out school desegregation at the grassroots level. Many kinds of community relations activities are more effectively done by community organizations than school districts because of grassroots connections. Further, school desegregation involves the community to a much greater extent than do most educational activities, and school districts simply need community organizations

[1] HR 92-576,15(1971).

more in this case to carry out district policy successfully. In Vol. III, an analysis of the effectiveness of community organizations in facilitating desegregation, the data indicate that community organizations involved in some types of community relations and monitoring activities score high on organizational effectiveness, thus validating the above assertions. The extent to which community organizations promote changes in district policies is also positively related to effectiveness. Therefore, much of the organization and discussion in this report reflect those major findings, although this volume can also be read separately.

Section II briefly describes the demographic characteristics of NPOs; Sec. III examines NPO activities; and Sec. IV looks at NPOs as change-agent organizations. Section V discusses the major findings and areas for policy recommendations.

The data analysis in this volume is based on responses to questionnaires mailed to all 215 funded NPOs in FY76; 81 percent returned completed questionnaires.[1] Response reliability is examined in App. B.

Our original design included a comparison of the responses of NPO applicants not funded in FY76. Only in this manner could we confidently assess programmatic biases in the funding process. For example, organizations of a particular type might not be funded; activity types might vary between funded and unfunded organizations. Unfortunately, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) did not permit questionnaires to be sent to unfunded organizations, because this was judged an unnecessary respondent burden on organizations no longer related to the program.

---

[1]Possible bias in mail questionnaire returns was examined by HEW region, size of NPO, and whether NPO was funded in FY77. No statistically significant differences in return rates were found in terms of these variables.

II. NPO DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTIC

The major items of descriptive interest about NPOs include:

- o Are they staffed with minority group members?
- o Are they staffed with longer term residents rather than newcomers to the area?
- o What is the distribution of organizational types in the NPO program?
- o What are the characteristics of the school districts with NPOs?

RACIAL COMPOSITION OF STAFF

NPO directors are predominantly minority: 43 percent are black, and 17 percent are minorities other than black (12 percent Hispanic). As a reference point, 11 percent of the U.S. population over 18 years of age was minority (black and all others) in 1970.[1] The staff is heavily minority; NPOs have an average of 40 percent black staff members and 20 percent minorities other than black. The organization staffs are nearly equally desegregated or have a majority of one race or another; 13 percent of the NPOs have 75 percent or more white staff members, 20 percent have 75 percent or more black staff members, and 13 percent have 75 percent or more of minorities other than black. This means that 46 percent of all NPOs have a dominant staffing pattern of one race.

STAFF RESIDENCE

NPO directors and staff tend to be long-term residents; 53 percent of NPO directors have lived in the area served by the project ten years or more. Only 17 percent lived in the area less than two years. The same situation exists for staff; NPOs have an average of 49 percent of staff who have lived in the area ten years or more. Actually, 20 percent of all directors report that *all* of their staff have lived in the area ten years or more.

---

[1] U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *United States Summary: 1970 Census of Population*, February 1973, p. P1-593.

ORGANIZATION TYPES

We classified NPOs into four types of organizations: (1) independent locally based organizations not sponsored by, affiliated with, or part of a larger local organization; (2) locally based organizations sponsored by a part of a larger local organization; (3) chapters of national organizations; and (4) the consortium. This last type is an ESAA program term meaning a coalition of organizations, which can be composed of any combination of the other three, such as a chapter of a national organization and an independent local organization, and they receive a single ESAA-NPO award.

Twenty-four percent of the NPOs are independent local organizations, 38 percent are local organizations sponsored by a part of a larger local organization, 30 percent are chapters of national organizations, and only 8 percent are consortia. The idea of including the consortium among the funding possibilities was to encourage a number of small local organizations to coalesce to provide a greater mix of activities than possible for a single organization and to encourage integration of activities at the local level.

Our fieldwork indicates some reasons why the consortium has not caught on: (1) overlapping rather than unique constituencies for activities among local organizations, which means that local organizations tend to be competitive with little incentive to give up power or credibility to one another; and (2) the feeling that single organizations have a better chance of obtaining funding than a consortium. A lower quality presentation by any consortium member in the proposal will affect all the organizations applying because it will lower the total score of the proposal and make it less likely to obtain the high scores necessary for funding. Hence, it is not likely that the consortium will compose a significantly larger percentage of the funded organizations in the NPO program in the future than they do now.

DISTRICT CHARACTERISTICS

Districts with NPOs have an average black school enrollment of 36 percent and an average minority enrollment (blacks plus all others) of

53 percent. The average minority enrollment for all school districts in 1970 was 18 percent.[1]

In addition to the racial composition of district enrollment, the NPO questionnaire attempts to measure the desegregation phase of the school district. Desegregation phase was measured by a series of questions about the status of the desegregation plan in the district.[2] The following are the desegregation phases and percentages of NPOs in each phase:

- Of all districts with NPOs, 19 percent have no desegregation plan, only a minority isolation plan.
- Eight percent of the districts had one or more plans, but no final plan has been approved by a court or the appropriate agencies.
- Fourteen percent of the districts have a final plan to be carried out next year or have a plan that is being carried out but has not reached completion.
- Nine percent of all NPO districts have completed plan implementation of plans less than five years old.
- Fifty percent of all NPO districts had completed desegregation plans five or more years ago.

Of the districts with NPOs, 69 percent either have no desegregation plan or completed their plan five or more years ago, and 23 percent of NPO districts are in an active desegregation phase. These statistics imply that 69 percent of NPO efforts occur outside of an active desegregation environment and that the modal district for NPO activity is one with a completed desegregation phase.

---

[1] U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, *United States Summary: 1970 Census of Population*, February 1973, p. P1-609.

[2] See App. A.

III. NPO ACTIVITIES

The main issues of interest are:

- o What activities do NPOs engage in, and how frequently?
- o What NPO characteristics are associated with some activities rather than others?

NPO project directors were provided a list of 27 activities NPOs might undertake. They were asked to indicate which of the activities they undertook most frequently, less frequently, and not at all.

A tentative activities list was derived from coding the NPO proposals themselves. This list was cross-referenced to the authorized activities in the regulations and submitted to our advisory committee for suggestions and revisions. The final list was included in the questionnaire.

The measurement of frequency of activities should not be understood as completely analogous to resources expended, because an NPO can often engage in an activity (such as distributing newsletters) involving a small dollar expenditure. Unfortunately, most NPO budgets do not indicate resources expended on various activities, and on the basis of questionnaire pretest activities we found that not all NPO directors could make such judgments. Therefore, we decided on frequency as an *indicator* of resources expended. Assuming that frequency and resource allocation are positively correlated across all NPOs, the result would indicate how resources were being expended.[1]

Table 1 indicates which activities NPOs undertake most and least often, according to project directors' responses. The activities undertaken most often tend to be either community relations or educational-services related, whereas the activities undertaken least tend to be either advocacy or monitoring activities.

---

[1] Unfortunately, a new problem occurred during the OMB clearance process: Our measurement of frequency in terms of man-hours expended was considered too complicated and was deleted.

Table 1

MOST AND LEAST FREQUENT ACTIVITIES OF NPOs

Most Frequent Activities (75% or more of NPOs)	Least Frequent Activities (25% or less of NPOs)
Cultural enrichment or recreation, including fieldtrips, bazaars, and plays (84%)	Bringing suit against the district, or being party to a suit (3%)
Parent training in educational preparation for their children, including leadership and effectiveness training (83%)	Lobbying for school site selection or against school closings (15%)
Improving self-concepts, including such tools as sensitivity sessions and encounter groups (81%)	School monitoring, including buses, hallways, or playgrounds (22%)
School-community liaison, including organizing PTAs or arranging student-parent conferences (81%)	Influencing district budget or funds distribution (22%)
Information dissemination, including developing or distributing newsletters or maintaining libraries (78%)	Monitoring of student transfer policies or practices (25%)
Conducting needs assessments or surveys (75%)	Monitoring the hiring and firing of minority personnel (25%)

Our fieldwork[1] indicates that the most likely reason for this finding is the requirement that the LEA sign off on the NPO proposal. For example, in one case an NPO proposed to undertake an active community relations effort in a district carrying out its desegregation plan. The proposed activity involved counseling parents and students at schools paired in the desegregation plan. The project director was told to limit the program to a single school and emphasize a remedial program instead or the district would not sign off on the proposal. Although

[1]Fieldwork procedures are discussed in detail in Vol. III.

federal NPO program personnel indicate that the district signoff means only that the district is aware of the NPO proposal and does not necessarily approve of it, the interpretation in the field is quite different. Most NPO project directors indicate that signoff really means approval. It is true that some funded NPOs do not receive district approval even with a signoff (three out of 215 funded in FY76), but the small incidence indicates a low likelihood and by inference that approval and signoff function in the same manner.

Simply eliminating the district signoff will not necessarily produce more effective NPOs. First, some activities included in building community support for a desegregation plan or in carrying out a plan might involve the school district and require its approval if those activities are to be effective. Second, increasing the role of advocacy or monitoring will not necessarily make the program more effective. School district opposition to the NPO is likely to escalate under these conditions, and intense district opposition might reduce the effects for advocacy activities in general. We examine this possibility in Vol. III.

There are reasons to believe that the inclusion of the LEA signoff requirement occurred because the Community Groups program under ESAP *was* more of an advocacy program, which increased district official complaints to members of Congress, who in turn registered their protests with the ESAA operations personnel in the Office of Education. OE personnel frequently met with members of Congress to explain the rights of NPO groups and to identify protest activities as legally acceptable. However, there were still objections to certain advocacy activities.[1]

In addition to examining activities separately, we examined activities in groups for purposes of data reduction and greater conceptual understanding. The entire list of 27 activities was submitted to a factor analysis, and three separate groups of activities emerged. These three factors explained 90 percent of the variance in all activity scores. Table 2 includes a list of the activity groups.

Factor analysis indicates which activities occur more often in combination and less often with other activities. But activities tending to occur together need not indicate substantive meaning. In the present case, however, the three groups could be given substantive interpretation.

---

[1]This situation is discussed in Vol. I.

Table 2

ACTIVITY TYPES AND FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE[a]

Educational Services	Desegregation/Community Relations	Desegregation/Monitoring
Cultural enrichment or recreation, including fieldtrips, bazaars, and plays (84%)	School-community liaison, including organizing PTAs or arranging student-parent conferences (81%)	Monitoring of student transfer policies or practices (25%)
Remedial services, including turoring and language labs (67%)	Information dissemination, including developing or distributing newsletters or maintaining libraries (78%)	Lobbying for school site selection or against school closings (15%)
Career guidance, planning or counseling (65%)	Conducting needs assessments or surveys (75%)	Bringing suit against the district, or being a party to the suit (3%)
Dropout prevention, expulsion and suspension programs (61%)	Building or maintaining support for desegregation or desegregation plan (69%)	
Establishing alternative schools or classrooms for students whose needs may be better met outside the classroom (47%)	Efforts to reduce white flight from desegregation (51%)	
	Rumor control or hotlines (37%)	

[a]Percentage of NPOs ever undertaking the activity.

The first group of activities represents traditional educational services that might supplement regular district activities or even replace them. They are responses to either the kinds of educational problems usually handled by educational systems, or so-called "second generation" desegregation problems, which arise after the desegregation plan has been carried out. For example, NPOs might provide remedial services in response to needs arising specifically as a result of desegregation, or simply because a school district cannot or will not use its own funds for such services.

The second group of activities we call desegregation-community relations because they indicate activities in which NPOs perform liaison work in desegregation between the district and the community at large. For example, building or maintaining support for the desegregation plan is usually a community relations effort to assist in obtaining acceptance or cooperation with an official plan at least ratified (if not approved) by a school district. School-community liaison activities, including organizing PTAs, obviously fit into this context, as does conducting needs assessments or surveys, which are usually done at the request of a district to ascertain community opinion.

The third group is called desegregation-monitoring activities. It includes bringing suit against a district, monitoring of student transfer policies, and lobbying for appropriate school site selection. These activities indicate a fairly strong advocacy posture in relationship to the desegregation plan and the district.

A word about activities that are not included in the factors will provide substantive confirmation for the conceptual categories suggested.[1] Of the activities listed in Table 1, improving self-concept is not included. The most likely place for improving self-concept is in the educational services activities factor, but it did not emerge there probably because it is less often a traditional education activity than the other activities in the factor. Similarly, the activity of monitoring the hiring and firing of minority personnel did not coalesce with the other monitoring activities, probably because NPOs

[1] Correlations between the activities included and not included in the factors are available upon request.

engage in it regardless of the status of a desegregation plan; monitoring the hiring and firing of minority personnel is not necessarily a *desegregation*-monitoring activity.

Table 3 shows the correlations between activity scores for all activities included in the factors. The matrix shows that the activities included in each factor occur in combination with one another and *not* in combination with the activities in other factors. This means that NPOs tend to engage in activities of one rather than of several types.[1]

The activities included in each factor were summed so that each NPO had a score on each factor representing the total number of activities undertaken of that type. These scores constitute the data base for the remaining analysis in this section.

ACTIVITY TYPES AND ORGANIZATION CHARACTERISTICS

Undertaking one type of activity or another might be affected by organization type, some types of organizations being more amenable to some types of activities than others.

Table 4 shows the relationship between activity types and organization types. Generally, there is little relationship, but the national chapters do tend to undertake both community relations and monitoring more than the other types of organizations.

ACTIVITY TYPES AND REGIONAL OFFICE INPUT

Regional Office input into NPO operations has not been examined until this point because of the expectation that Regional Offices have little if any effect on either staff characteristics or organization

---

[1]The intercorrelations between factors substantiate the point: Education Services and Desegregation-Community Relations = .149; Education Services and Desegregation-Monitoring = .123; Desegregation-Community Relations and Desegregation-Monitoring = .240. These compare with a median intercorrelation between activities in the *same* cluster: Education Services = .380, Desegregation-Community Relations = .323, and Desegregation-Monitoring = .297. All the latter values are higher.

Table 3

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ACTIVITIES INCLUDED IN FACTORS

Activity	Factor: Educational Services					Desegregation/Community Relations						Desegregation Monitoring	
	Cultural Enrichment	Remedial Services	Career Guidance	Dropout Prevention	Alternative Schools	School-Community Liaison	Information Dissemination	Needs Assessments	Support Desegregation Plan	Reduce White Flight	Rumor Control	Student Transfer	School Site Selection
Remedial services	.346												
Career guidance	.370	.495											
Dropout prevention	.354	.420	.556										
Alternative schools	.247	.384	.438	.380									
School-community liaison	.211	.202	.193	.293	.056								
Information dissemination	.138	.003	.030	.103	.015	.329							
Needs assessment	.180	.127	.245	.336	.186	.472	.300						
Support desegregation plan	.153	.026	.134	.167	.153	.432	.416	.399					
Reduce white flight	.072	.030	.021	.045	.059	.210	.285	.174	.309				
Rumor control	.152	.063	.135	.180	.092	.310	.332	.323	.463	.262			
Monitoring student transfer	.042	.086	.143	.217	.144	.274	.201	.265	.309	.07[illegible]	.194		
Monitoring school site selection	-.091	.026	.070	.116	.099	.017	.091	.181	.215	.071	.034	.297	
Bringing suit against the district	-.067	.062	.079	.083	.064	-.054	.108	.126	.139	-.021	.101	.321	.215

Significance levels: .05 > .134
.01 > .189
.001 > .249

Table 4

ACTIVITY TYPE, BY ORGANIZATION TYPE[a]

Organization	Educational Services	Community Relations	Monitoring
Independent local	-.111	-.079	-.067
Local	-.145[b]	-.025	-.113
Consortium	-.058	-.030	-.026
National chapter	.021	.124[b]	.153[c]

[a]This and all subsequent tables include the T_c correlation, which is used in preference to the Pearson because of the noninterval level of the data. The Tau statistics were selected in preference to other nonparametric alternatives because these are least affected by the marginal distributions of the data (particularly Kruscal's Gamma or Sommers' D). See William L. Hayes, *Statistics for Psychologists*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., N.Y., 1963, pp. 615-658.

[b]Significant at .05 level.

[c]Significant at .01 level.

types. In fact, the data confirm this hypothesis; none of the Regional Office variables described below correlates with organization or staff characteristics.

Regional Office input is more likely at the activity stage of operations because its personnel actually review activities in a preliminary reading of the proposals.

Regional Office participation with NPOs was assessed both at the pre-proposal and proposal stages. NPO directors were asked whether they attended any meetings held by the Regional Office to explain the program before they submitted their proposal in final form, whether they attended other than sponsored meetings, and whether they received other pre-proposal assistance. Responses to these questions were summed to give a total score for each director.

In addition to asking about pre-proposal assistance, the questionnaire included a list of different areas in proposal development for which Regional Office personnel could provide assistance. These areas

were selected by a Rand staff review of the regulations and the Manual for Program Officers: *Technical Assistance to Nonprofit Agencies.*[1] Individual NPO projects were given a score equal to the number of areas in which they received assistance from this list:

- Describing the relationship between school district needs, NPO objectives, and your organization's activities.
- Distinguishing between educational problems related to desegregation or minority isolation and other educational problems.
- Describing how your organization's activities relate to the school district's plan for reducing minority isolation or segregation.
- Organizing and formatting the proposal.
- Understanding Office for Civil Rights compliance requirements.
- Differentiating between authorized and unauthorized activities.
- Deciding what the responsibilities of the Advisory Committee should be.

A third variable was scored from a question about where NPO directors first heard about the ESAA-NPO program. Responses that the Regional Office was their first source were scored as another variable.

Table 5 shows the relationship among all three Regional Office variables and activity types. The major finding is that Regional Office inputs are related to undertaking more educational services and community-relations activities. Obviously, of the two desegregation efforts, community-relations work is the less controversial and less likely to get the Regional Office in trouble with the school districts, an obvious incentive for them not to encourage monitoring activities[2]

---

[1] U.S. Office of Education document, November 1975. A list of ten areas was submitted to factor analysis and scores were selected as a result of this analysis.

[2] For a more detailed discussion of Regional Office constituencies, see S. Crocker et al., *Title IV of the Civil Rights Act of 1964: A Review of Program Operations*, The Rand Corporation, R-1901-HEW, August 1976.

Table 5

ACTIVITY TYPE, BY REGIONAL OFFICE INPUT

Input	Educational Services	Community Relations	Monitoring
Pre-proposal assistance	.128[a]	.134[a]	.014
Proposal assistance	.117[a]	.130[a]	.049
First heard about ESAA from Regional Office	.170[b]	-.050	-.020

[a]Significant at .05 level.

[b]Significant at .01 level.

Our fieldwork indicates that Regional Office participation in selecting activities can either be direct or indirect. A Regional Office project officer can tell an NPO directly to change proposed activities. For example, one NPO director was apparently told to drop a parent involvement program in favor of a tutorial program because the latter would be more likely to receive a higher proposal rating. The indirect influence can occur by means of the school district; the LEA contacts the Regional Office about the propriety of an activity and relays the information to the NPO. These instances are not numerous but do show how such influence takes place.

ACTIVITY TYPES AND DESEGREGATION STATUS

Reviewing the activity types in terms of desegregation phases provides a means for understanding whether the program actually operates by directing activities to some desegregation phases rather than others.

The desegregation community-relations factor consists mostly, but not completely, of activities done in the implementation phases of desegregation. Of the six activities listed in Table 2 in that factor, four are more likely to occur during the active phase; the other two (school-community liaison activities and information dissemination) are probably invariant to phase. Hence, if there is a targeting element to program activities, one would expect to see NPOs doing more community relations work in active phases.

Volume I examines the reasons why community relations are particularly useful to be undertaken by community groups. Briefly, unlike school district organizations that might undertake the same kinds of activities, community organizations have deeper roots in the communities affected by desegregation; hence, they have a number of advantages during the implementation phase. The grassroots nature of such organizations provides for greater opportunities to hear about problems and, hence, the possibility for reaching solutions earlier so that isolated events are less likely to become major issues. Other reasons include greater credibility of these organizations with community elements, greater understanding of acceptable solutions to problems, and greater ability to mobilize community support.

The education-series factor appears to include a list of so-called "second-generation" desegregation problems--problems that occur as a result of pupil reassignment to desegregated environments. For example, minority dropouts and suspensions are likely to increase after a plan is implemented, and there is often greater apparent need for remedial services for minorities. In fact, in testimony before Congress, ESAA program people specifically argue that justification for funding so many compensatory activities under the Emergency School Aid Act rather than the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is that the projects funded under ESAA are occurring in response to the implementation of a desegregation plan.[1] Therefore, if targeting occurs regarding educational services activities, it should be primarily after the plan is begun.

There is a caveat to this generalization; educational services activities related to desegregation should probably appear during the earlier years of desegregation to be associated with it. Otherwise, one could argue that the kind of assistance being offered moves away from "second-generation" desegregation problems and closer to compensatory educational assistance provided by a school district.

---

[1] *Hearings before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives*, 94th Cong., 2d Sess., Part 5, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Education, 1976, pp. 262 and 285; ibid., 1st Sess., Part 1: Education Division Overview, 1975, p. 253.

Table 6 presents the average number of activities by type and desegregation phase. The major finding is that there is *no* systematic relationship between activity types and desegregation phase of the school district--activities apparently occur at random with regard to desegregation phase.

Table 6

AVERAGE NUMBER OF ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN, BY TYPE AND DESEGREGATION PHASE[a]

Activity	No Desegregation or Minority Isolation Plan (N = 29)	No Final Plan or Final Plan Not Yet Initiated (N = 14)	Plan in Process of Implementation (N = 21)	Plan Implemented five or Fewer Years Ago (N = 24)	Plan Implemented More Than Five Years Ago (N = 43)	Total Sample (N = 131)
Educational services	3.21	2.50	3.19	2.57	3.18	3.01
Community relations	3.66	3.07	3.71	3.86	3.73	3.66
Monitoring	.38	.43	.62	.33	.52	.46

[a]None of the differences between means are statistically significant at the .05 level.

As indicated above, we expected that educational services would more often be selected in later rather than earlier desegregation phases, but the data do not substantiate this expectation. The highest average number occurs in districts with no desegregation plan, or with minority isolation plans--those stages when educational services are probably most unrelated to desegregation. Also, contrary to expectation, educational services are more likely in districts that have been desegregated over five years rather than five years or less. This would indicate that educational services provided by NPOs are weakly associated with specific effects of plan implementation in early years.

Finally, the second highest average for educational services activities occurs in districts currently carrying out desegregation plans. This seems a rather high emphasis given that districts in this phase face many difficulties of other types that community organizations could help alleviate. The table does not support the contention that

educational services provided by NPOs are either desegregation-related or targeted to districts with "second-generation" problems.

Our earlier discussion about the community-relations activities finds little substantiation in the data in Table 6. The most generous reading in this regard is that the highest average number of activities occurs in districts in the process of desegregation, but the difference is not statistically significant. A particularly confounding result is the apparently large average number of community-relations activities going on in districts without a desegregation plan; it is unclear what functions NPOs could be providing to support desegregation in such a context. Once again, these results indicate no targeting or relationship to desegregation phase.

Finally, Table 6 shows little phase-related behavior for monitoring, although it is not clear that monitoring is less appropriate for one desegregation phase than another, as the discussion in Vol. I indicates. There is a slight tendency for more monitoring during plan implementation, a not unexpected occurrence. These data indicate that phase is not the major problem, in the sense that NPOs are engaging in monitoring activities out of phase, but rather that there is a low incidence of monitoring activities.

THE ROLE OF PARTICIPATION BY OUTSIDE GROUPS ON ACTIVITY TYPES

NPO directors were asked about the extent of participation in their project by local school district administrators, advisory committee members, community members (active groups or individuals outside the school system) and national organization personnel (if local chapters). They were asked to rate the extent of participation from "none at all" to "a great deal" in each of seven areas:

- Establishing the project.
- Setting organizational goals.
- Developing the proposal for ESAA funding.
- Selecting activities to undertake.
- Developing programs for carrying out activities.
- Staffing.
- Budgeting.

Project directors' ratings of participation in all seven areas were summed to produce scores representing the total influence of local school district administrators, advisory committee members, community members, and national organization personnel for each NPO.[1]

These variables were examined for two reasons: (1) to assess the effect of each of these groups on NPO operations, and (2) specifically to compare advisory committee participation with the other two local level groups to discover whether it more closely resembled community or school district participation. In particular we would like to see whether the advisory committee mechanism in the NPO program was actually working as intended to represent community (active groups or people outside the school system) concerns in the organization.

The advisory committee (AC) component of ESAA was developed to build community input into the program so that it did not become removed from its constituency.[2] All ESAA program components include advisory committee requirements. The regulations contain explicit guidelines for composition and use of ACs. ACs are to be consulted before the proposal is written, to review the final product, and to serve in an advisory capacity during the operational phase of the project.

At least five civic or community organizations broadly representative of the community select a member. In addition, the NPO selects at least one school board member, administrator, principal, or teacher from the LEA, and is required to have at least one member of the LEA-AC as a member of the NPO-AC if the LEA receives an ESAA basic grant. Half of the committee members must be minority, and at least half of the members must be parents of students directly affected by the NPO project. The names of AC members are published in a newspaper prior to proposal submission, and evidence of such publication is included in the proposal.

---

[1] Nine original items were factors analyzed and seven survived as a single factor for all four groups (school district administrators, advisory committee members, community members, and national organization personnel).

[2] The reasons for its inclusion in the legislation are examined in Vol. I.

AC members are required to review the proposal prior to submission. No amendment to the program or additional funds can be approved unless the committee has been consulted and given the opportunity to comment. During the operational phase, NPOs are required by the regulations to meet at least once a month with the AC and to provide the AC with a reasonable opportunity to observe and comment on project activities.

Clearly, the regulations intend a critical role for the advisory committee and, given that its composition is dominantly community based, that it represent grassroots input.

In addition to these variables, we scored the extent of coordination of NPO activities with the ESAA basic grant as a means to assess local level ESAA program influences on NPO activities.

Table 7 reports the correlations between activity types and participation of outside groups. First, the patterns of school district and advisory committee participation look more similar than different; increased participation by both groups tends to be associated with more educational services. In addition, the local level ESAA thrust is in the direction of more educational services. Thus, the established

Table 7

ACTIVITY TYPE, BY PARTICIPATION OF OUTSIDE GROUPS

Outside Group	Education Services	Community Relations	Monitoring
School district administration participation	.130[a]	.038	-.099
Advisory committee participation	.136[a]	.050	.094
Community participation	.057	.090	.153[b]
National organization participation	.114	.352[b]	.268[a]
Coordination with ESAA basic grant	.202[b]	.091	.008

[a]Significant at .05 level.

[b]Significant at .01 level.

local level programmatic participation (the advisory committee and coordination with the basic grant) is in the same direction as the direct school district participation. Participation of the community, however, is toward a greater emphasis on monitoring. Thus, the ESAA-NPO advisory committee is *not* functioning similarly to community participation, which implies that advisory committee members are not representative of the community.

Our fieldwork indicates that ESAA-NPO advisory committee members tend to be selected from a fairly small group of activist parents in the school district. They are often the same ones who participate in Title I advisory councils or PTA affairs. Because these educational activists tend to develop social and political relationships with school district personnel and activists from other spheres (such as service organizations indirectly related to providing educational assistance), they may become removed from their larger constituency, the community.

Thus, the idea that community level participation provides a different thrust than school districts is substantiated by the data. The advisory committee, however, apparently does not usually function as a mechanism that provides community input.

The second major finding of Table 7 relates to national organization participation in local chapters; greater national participation is associated with undertaking more community relations and monitoring activities. This explains the earlier correlation between the NPO being a local chapter of a national organization and undertaking these types of activities more often.

Our fieldwork confirms this finding; one local chapter of a national organization refused to involve itself in a court case until the national organization forced it to intervene.

The national organization link with local chapters, explaining their greater activity in monitoring and community relations, presents a problem; very few indicate any involvement with the national organization. Eighty-eight percent of NPOs characterized themselves as independent from their national organization. Only one of the seven activities listed that could involve national participation is scored

by more than 25 percent of local chapters as having a great deal or quite a bit of participation by the national organization--setting organizational goals. On the other six activities, an average of 10 percent of local chapters score the national organization as participating quite a bit or a great deal. Hence, the incidence of local chapters receiving any appreciable input from the national organization is extremely small. It is probable that just a few are subject to the levels of influences that promote substantial monitoring and community relations activities; most are only formally associated with national organizations and relate to them only in an *ad hoc* manner.

CONCLUSIONS

Few NPOs are engaged in monitoring activities; the most frequent activities are educational services and community relations. The LEA signoff operates as a check on activities that could place the NPO in an adversary relationship with the school district.

In terms of organization types, chapters of national organizations show the greatest tendency to undertake the community relations and monitoring activities. This seems attributable to the influence of the national organization on the local chapter. The problem is that few locals have any meaningful relationships with their national organization.

Regional Offices apparently are providing a programmatic thrust in the direction of educational services and community relations; monitoring is probably not encouraged because it promotes problematic and political relationships between OE staff and school districts.

There is no apparent relationship between desegregation phase and NPO activities: NPOs undertake their activities unrelated to the desegregation context of the school district. In addition, the phase behavior of education services activities indicates that these services might not be desegregation related. The major problem with NPO monitoring activities is not that they appear out of phase or inappropriate to the desegregation phase of a school district, but that they have an extremely low incidence; the average number of monitoring activities is less than one half of one activity per NPO.

The role of outside groups on activity types has also been examined. Both school district administration *and* advisory committee participation in the organization are associated with undertaking more educational services activities. Coordination with the ESAA basic grant also is positively associated with undertaking more educational services activities. Thus, the two ESAA programmatic elements at the local level--the advisory committee and ESAA basic grant personnel--are associated with educational services activities. This is also supported by the school district, and the Regional Office. The single exception is community participation in the organization, which is associated with more monitoring activities. This shows that the advisory committee is not operating as a mechanism for transmitting community concerns to the NPO program.

IV. NPOs AS CHANGE AGENTS

NPOs operating as organizations promoting change in school districts are examined from two perspectives:

- To what extent are NPOs operating as agents for change?
- What characteristics are associated with NPOs acting more or less often as change agents?

The study includes two measures of NPO attempts to change school district behavior: (1) activist actions by NPOs in response to a disagreement with a local school district, and (2) attempts to influence local school or district policies. The first is a measure of organizational conflict with the school district and is intended to measure attempted change by means of active and public advocacy of the NPO's policy position. The second is intended to measure attempted change in established policies to assess NPO influence on the school system. Both indicators are examined because NPOs may attempt to promote change in either or both modes.

The measure of an activist relationship with the school district consists of a four-item Guttman scale measuring the incidence of various actions when an NPO disagrees with the school district on an issue of importance to the group:[1]

- Sought a private meeting with school officials.
- Appeared at school board meetings to express opposition.
- Wrote letters of protest to appropriate representatives of the local school district.
- Wrote letters of protest to the local newspaper.

The most frequent activity (36 percent of NPOs) is *seeking* a meeting with school officials, the most minimal activist role. Actually, 29 percent of NPOs did not engage in any of the activities listed

[1]The scale has a coefficient of reproducibility of .95.

above, either because they never have a dispute with their school district or because they altered their group's activities or goals when confronted by a disagreement with the school district. This means that either no activist activity or simply seeking a private meeting with public officials constitutes the response to a disagreement with the local school district by 65 percent of the NPOs. Only 4 percent of NPOs have ever engaged in all four activities. The summary impression is that NPOs are scarcely adversaries with the school district.[1]

To measure attempted policy influence, we asked NPO directors to note their level of effort (from "no effort" to "much effort") in each of seven policy areas. Table 8 displays the results. The primary focus of attempts to influence policy is on attitudes of district personnel; 79 percent of NPOs indicate some or much effort in this area. Curriculum revision is the next focus, but there is a drop to 49 percent of NPOs indicating some or much effort in this area. The least effort is made in attempts to influence the hard-core policy areas of school site selection, budgets, and personnel. Actually, 56 to 72 percent of NPOs indicate they made no effort in these four areas.

We also asked NPO directors to assess their success in areas they tried to influence. Table 9 displays the results. For every policy area except two (attitudes of district personnel and curriculum revision), 53 to 83 percent of NPOs have never tried to influence policy, or tried and rate themselves as not at all successful. At the other end of the scale, with the exception of attempts at influencing attitudes of district personnel, less than 10 percent of NPO directors rate the organization's efforts as very successful. This table also shows less success in such policy issues as budgets and school site selections.

In general, either in terms of an activist posture or influence on district policies, NPOs do not appear to be heavily engaged in actions promoting change, or to be particularly successful when influence attempts are made.

---

[1] In the reverse index of the items listed on the previous page, the cumulative percentages are, all four activities, 4 percent; three activities, 13 percent; two activities, 18 percent; one activity, 36 percent; no activity, 29 percent.

Table 8

EFFORT TO INFLUENCE LOCAL SCHOOL, BY POLICY AREA

(In percent)

Policy Area	Much Effort	Some Effort	Little Effort	No Effort
Attitudes of district personnel	42	37	14	7
Curriculum revision	17	32	22	29
Pupil placement	13	27	20	40
Job skills of district personnel	11	18	15	56
Personnel placement and hiring policies	6	19	18	57
School district budgets	2	14	18	66
School site selection	4	10	14	72

Table 9

PERCEIVED SUCCESS, BY POLICY AREA

(In percent)

Policy Area	Very Successful	Somewhat Successful	Slightly Successful	Not at All Successful	Never Tried to Influence
Attitudes of district personnel	11	40	32	10	7
Curriculum revision	7	21	31	13	29
Pupil placement	4	15	28	13	40
Job skills of district personnel	2	14	16	12	56
Personnel placement and hiring	5	10	14	11	57
School district budgets		5	11	18	66
School site selection	3	4	10	11	72

Project director responses on the activist and policy influence variable are used as the basis for further data analysis; the purpose is to discover characteristics associated with greater activist or policy influence behavior.

THE ROLE OF OUTSIDE GROUPS

One purpose in examining the role of outside groups is to assess the similarities or differences between advisory committee input and school district input on one hand, and community input on the other. Another is to assess whether any of these groups' participation are actually associated with the variables under investigation.

Table 10 shows the relationship between the participation of outside groups in NPO operations and the two measures of change agent behavior. School district administrators, advisory committee members, and community members show different patterns. Greater participation by school district administrators tends toward fewer activist actions by the NPO. This would be expected because district participation would tend to neutralize the force for change.[1] What is interesting is that there is no strong positive relationship between greater school district administrator participation and more attempts to influence district policy. This implies that the administration contact personnel for NPOs are not likely to be advocates for change themselves, or else they would certainly encourage NPOs to attempt to influence policy if for no other purpose than to assist them in mobilizing their own resources.

Participation by advisory committee personnel seems to be associated with greater attempts to influence policy, but *not* with an increased activist posture. This result provides confirmation for our earlier statement about the kinds of people who serve on the ESAA-NPO advisory committee--those whose constituency becomes the school officials they should be trying to influence rather than the community at large. Advisory committee members probably encourage change by NPOs

[1] This statement is generally true because most school districts do not desegregate voluntarily but are required to do so by court order.

Table 10

CHANGE AGENT BEHAVIOR, BY PARTICIPATION OF OUTSIDE GROUPS IN THE ORGANIZATION

Outside Group	Activist Posture	Attempts to Influence District Policy
School district administration participation	-.152[a]	.093
Advisory committee participation	.089	.190[a]
Community participation	.213[a]	.371[a]
National organization participation	.086	.241[a]
Coordination with ESAA basic grant	-.064	.188[a]

[a]Significant at the .01 level.

along the lines of established channels directed at established policies, rather than suggesting that the organization adopt a public activist position because that could upset the credibility of the participating parents with district officials.

Participation by community members is strongly associated with both activist and influence actions. The level of correlation with attempts to influence district policy is much higher for community participants than for advisory committee participation; this also confirms that advisory committee members are probably more oriented toward the school district establishment and hence would not push as hard for change. Community participation is the only form positively associated with greater activist and influence actions. Thus, the data support the assertion that greater community participation leads to a greater tendency for the organization to promote change in general. However, the data indicate that the advisory committee *as a mechanism* is not providing this kind of input.

Table 10 also indicates that NPO coordination with the ESAA basic grant is positively associated with greater attempts to influence district policy. In conjunction with the nonsignificant correlation between school district administration participation and attempts to influence policy, the result indicates that NPO attempts to influence district policy probably occur with other persons or organizations

rather than independently. The community organization standing alone and functioning as an outsider attempting to promote change is not an NPO characteristic.

TYPES OF ACTIVITIES

Table 11 shows a positive correlation between all activity types and activist or influence actions. The greater the number of activities of any kind, the more likely it is that organizations are either going to conflict with the school district or to be in a position to influence district policies. The major finding in Table 11 is that educational services activities are *least* likely to be associated with either an activist posture (.140) or attempts to influence district policies (.157); both change agent behaviors are more highly associated with monitoring activities (.249, .266). This presents us with an additional argument against NPOs undertaking educational services activities, in the sense that if the program is intended to promote or facilitate change, these kinds of activities are the least likely of the three types to do so. Additional emphasis on monitoring activities would, according to these data, probably provide more of a change agent thrust in the program as a whole.

Table 11

CHANGE AGENT BEHAVIOR, BY ACTIVITY TYPE

Activity	Activist Posture	Attempts to Influence District Policy
Education services	.140[a]	.157[a]
Community relations	.251[b]	.201[b]
Monitoring	.249[b]	.266[b]

[a]Significant at the .05 level.

[b]Significant at the .01 level.

CONCLUSION

NPOs seldom take activist positions in relation to the school districts they work with; 29 percent never have a dispute with the school district. They are more likely to alter their activities or goals in response to a disagreement. Considering all possible responses, 65 percent of NPOs take no public activist actions.

In terms of attempts to influence policy, the least effort is made in hard-core policy areas such as district budgets, school site selection, or hiring and firing of personnel; 75 to 84 percent of NPO directors indicate no or a little effort in these areas. The most effort occurs in attempting to change the attitudes of district personnel and curriculum revision. Overall, NPOs seldom make any attempts to influence policies; in six out of seven areas, 51 to 86 percent of NPOs make no or a little effort. The program is not functioning to promote change in local school districts.

School district participation in the NPO appears to discourage activist actions by the NPO. Advisory committee participation is associated with influencing policy rather than activist actions, which confirms the school district establishment bias of the committee. Community participation relates to both increased activist and influence actions; this result stands in contrast to the advisory committee and indicates that the advisory committee is not functioning as a mechanism for community input.

Finally, educational services activities are least likely to be associated with activist or influence actions. This contrasts with monitoring activities, which are most positively associated with change related behavior. Under the assumption that the NPOs should be promoting change more than they are now, this finding provides an additional reason for de-emphasizing the former types of activities and emphasizing the latter.

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

A review of NPO operations has produced the following major findings:

- The overwhelming majority of NPOs are operating in districts that are not in active desegregation phases.
- NPO activities focus on community relations and educational services; there is little if any monitoring of school desegregation.
- Local chapters of national organizations are more likely than other types to engage in monitoring and community relations activities; this is apparently because of impetus from the national organization, but only 10 percent of affiliated NPOs have any meaningful relationship with their national organizations.
- The ESAA programmatic thrust at both the Regional Office and local level is toward more educational services activities.
- The NPO advisory committee is not operating as a mechanism for community participation in the organization.
- NPO activities are not related in any systematic manner to the desegregation phase of the school district.
- Educational services activities undertaken by NPOs appear less related to "second-generation" desegregation problems than traditional compensatory education assistance.
- NPOs seldom engage in actions promoting change at the district level, either in their manner of handling disputes with school districts or by attempting to influence district policies.
- Educational services activities are least likely to be associated with change agent activities by NPOs and hence do not assist in promoting activist relationships or attempts to influence district policies.

A complete set of policy recommendations based on all data sources is included in the final volume of this series; this report discusses

only areas for revision based on the descriptive material about program operations. The difficulty with producing recommendations based on only one data source is that recommendations might change when all sources have been examined. For example, NPOs are engaged in a small number of monitoring activities and one might want to encourage a greater number of such activities to provide more of a programmatic balance in that direction. Yet, an examination of the effectiveness data might show that the monitoring activities undertaken by NPOs are particularly ineffective, in which case there would be no advantage in restructuring the program along these lines.

On the basis of the data presented here, the following areas show the most need for revision:

- o The section of the Act requiring an ESAA-NPO advisory committee.

Even under the assumption that community input into an NPO is beneficial for reasons of constituency support, the data indicate that advisory committee input does not function in that manner. Either another mechanism should be provided that does represent community input, or the requirement should be dropped.

- o Educational services activities as authorized in the Act and in NPO regulations.

In general, NPO educational services activities are not clearly related to desegregation. They also are not associated with organizational policy advocacy. There are a number of possible reasons for this, all of which have been observed during our fieldwork. The present tight budget situation in a number of school districts has encouraged them to use federal funding to supplement regular instructional activities. NPO funds can be used indirectly to provide remedial services the district itself would pay for under other circumstances. In some districts with low commitments to the public school system, the NPO program indirectly uses federal money for regular instructional

activities so that the school system budget can run in balance or surplus. Also, because these programs usually involve remedial assistance to minorities, minority groups become the most exposed either to changes in federal priorities or to the vagaries of the funding process. Of course, educational services activities are very likely to obtain district cooperation according to NPO directors, and an organization that has to be refunded yearly will become risk averse in the sense of proposing activities that might disturb the district.

The systemic influences work to make NPOs provide educational services that are less controversial and supplement or supplant regular district expenditures in this area. Hence, eliminating any one or several educational services activities is unlikely to change the functions of educational services activities provided by NPOs. One alternative recommendation would be to target such assistance only to districts with desegregation plans less than five years old. This would at least maximize the possibility that the educational services provided are most related to desegregation even if the services provided by NPOs are not likely to be unique or would otherwise be done by a school district. By this change, one admits the necessity for dealing with "second-generation" desegregation problems but limits the assistance to districts most likely to experience such problems.

- The relationship between NPO grants and the desegregation phase of the school district.

The data indicate that, in general, NPOs are not targeting their activities to desegregation phase. More specifically, educational services activities occur to a great extent in all desegregation phases and appear to be less related to second-generation desegregation problems. Mechanisms for attaining targeted activities should be investigated to maximize programmatic impact.

- The regulation requiring LEA signoff on the ESAA-NPO proposal.

The data indicate that greater school district participation is associated with greater NPO emphasis on educational services activities

and little change agent behavior. The fieldwork indicates that the LEA signoff procedure is probably responsible for this. Almost every NPO director understands that the signoff functions as a veto power by the school district. Perhaps it was intended to ensure that communications be established between the organization and the district, but there is no *a priori* reason for assuming that the present mechanism is optimal. Numerous instances were observed in the field or activity changes as a result of district intervention, and most if not all of these were attributed to the signoff.

Specific policy recommendations relating to this and other major areas are discussed in the final volume.

Appendix A
A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF MAIL QUESTIONNAIRE CONTENTS

Questionnaires were sent to project directors for all FY76 funded NPOs; 81 percent were returned complete. The following is a variable list of questionnaire contents. The complete questionnaire is available from either The Rand Corporation or the Office of Planning, Budgeting and Evaluation of the U.S. Office of Education.

Organization Characteristics:

(1) Type of organization (independent local, local organization sponsored by or part of another local organization, local chapter of a national organization, consortium).

(2) (If sponsored by another organization) how well known sponsoring organization is in the community served and the city in general (hardly to very well known).

(3) Funding information, FY73-76
- o dollar amount of ESAA-NPO funding
- o percent of funding provided by ESAA
- o non-ESAA funding sources

(4) Director and staff characteristics:
- o number of paid staff
- o length of residence
- o ethnic background
- o source of recommendation
- o length of service

(5) Organizational background in school desegregation--type of experience.

Relationship to Outside Groups or Agencies:

(1) Participation by local school district administration, NPO advisory committee, community members and national

organizations (from not at all to a great deal) in nine issue areas (establishing the project, selecting activities, staffing, etc.).

(2) Relationship with local school district administration (very unfriendly to very friendly).

(3) How helpful advisory committee participation (not at all to very helpful).

(4) How helpful community members participation (not at all to very helpful).

(5) Relationship with national organization (very unfriendly; very dependent to very independent).

(6) Source of first NPO program information and whether first information was given formally or informally.

Regional Office Assistance:

(1) Pre-proposal assistance; meetings attended or other assistance (how helpful).

(2) Proposal assistance; specific items of assistance (how helpful).

(3) Post-proposal assistance; technical assistance, quarterly reports, on-site visits (how helpful, and changes that resulted).

(4) Technical assistance from other agencies.

Activities:

(1) Types of activities (don't do to most frequent).

(2) Target groups for activities (district administration, principals, teachers, etc.).

(3) Relationship between activities and school district's desegregation plan (limited or not limited to schools in the plan).

(4) Extent of coordination with ESAA basic grant (not at all to a great deal).

(5) Groups of persons involved in selecting or planning activities (district administrators, principals, teachers, etc.).

(6) Whether most important activities are also provided by the school district.

Activist Behavior:

(1) Attempts to influence policies (no effort to much effort) in eight issue areas (personnel placement and hiring, pupil placement, job skills of district personnel, etc.).

(2) Perceived success (never tried to influence to very successful) in same issue areas as above.

(3) How often project has disagreed with local school district policy (never to very often).

(4) Action when disagree with school district (altered group activities or goals, sought a private meeting with school officials, wrote letters of protest to local newspapers, etc.).

(5) Actions to support local candidates for public office.

District Characteristics:

(1) Ethnic distribution of school district enrollment.

(2) Whether minority enrollment has increased or decreased from 3 years ago.

(3) Whether school board is elected or appointed.

(4) Ethnic composition of school board.

(5) Whether superintendent is elected or appointed.

(6) Receptivity of school district administration to inputs from community groups (not at all to very receptive).

(7) School district's attitude toward innovation (very resistant to very open to change).

Desegregation Information:

(1) Status of desegregation plan (no desegregation plan to completed plan implementation).

(2) Characteristics of the plan:

- o voluntary vs. court-ordered
- o groups that prepared major plan features
- o groups that were required to approve the plan

- o first year of pupil reassignment
- o whether plan is being challenged in the court or court has released district
- o minority isolation or desegregation plan

(3) Importance of desegregation as an issue (not at all to most important).

(4) Which public officials or group leaders made public statements that school desegregation is inevitable (mayor, school superintendent, business leaders, etc.).

(5) Whether favorable or unfavorable attitudes toward desegregation had a positive or negative effect on the project.

Appendix B
ANALYSIS OF RESPONSE RELIABILITY

Reliability is measured first by a comparison of NPO director responses with dat ·ained in on-site interviews at 32 sites, and second by a comparison of the responses of NPO directors in the same school districts.

The survey contains two major types of indicators that are not NPO organization-specific. This non-specificity is required, because we must compare the responses of directors of different NPOs. The two types of indicators are a series of political and demographic characteristics of the school district, and data about the school district's desegregation plan.

Table B.1 presents the comparison between NPO director responses and on-site interview data. The level of agreement is highest for basic political and demographic facts, ranging from 80 to 97 percent. There is less agreement on the question of change in minority enrollment, reaching only 58 percent. There also is considerable variation in the desegregation plan data, agreement ranging from 50 to 81 percent. The fairly low desegregation plan percentages appear to result from a situation that has repeatedly come to our attention: NPO directors are quite uninvolved with the desegregation plans of their districts.

Table B.2 reports the results of comparing the responses of the NPO directors in the same school district. The general range of the reliability percentages is similar to that of Table B.1. Agreement in the first set of data ranges from 59 to 96 percent. Agreement in the desegregation plan set ranges from 54 to 96 percent. There are differences, however, in the rank order of the items in the two tables. For some questions, agreement is almost perfect; for others it is fairly low. The high percentages indicate that the directors are not giving random responses. The low percentages show that on some matters they are not well informed. Lack of involvement with the district's desegregation plan again appears to be the explanation.

Table B.1

COMPARISON OF NPO DIRECTOR RESPONSES WITH INTERVIEW DATA[a]

School District Data	Percent	Desegregation Plan Data	Percent
1. Is school board elected or appointed?	(97)	1. Does district have a desegregation plan?	(81)
2. Are board elections at large or by district?	(87)	2. Original impetus for plan (court order, HEW, voluntary, etc.).	(81)
3. Percentage of district enrollment by ethnicity.	(80)	3. Has court released district from the plan?	(74)
4. Has district enrollment become more or less minority in the last three years?	(58)	4. Is the plan being challenged in court?	(61)
		5. First year of pupil reassignment (within one year).	(59)
		6. Has pupil reassignment been completed?	(59)
		7. Since the plan was implemented, to what extent have schools become resegregated?	(55)
		8. Does the current plan add to or replace an earlier plan?	(50)

[a]Measured as response consistency between NPO project director mail questionnaire responses and on-site Rand interviewers. Figures in parentheses indicate percentage of responses in complete agreement.

This explanation gains support from an additional set of data. The NPO directors were given a list of public officials and community leaders and asked to indicate whether any of them had made public statements about the inevitability of school desegregation. Under the assumption that NPOs are isolated organizations, and that the NPO directors' partial lack of consistency was due to a lack of involvement, the rank order of response consistency should be directly related to the rank order of the familiarity that NPO directors have with these officials and leaders.

Table B.3 shows that the highest levels of reliability are obtained when the NPO directors answer questions about those people with whom they are most familiar. The response consistency is as high as 74 percent. This figure declines to 47 percent for the least familiar group. Our fieldwork has shown that there are roughly three levels of familiarity: (1) religious leaders and members of the school board, including the school board president; (2) school superintendent, city mayor, and

Table B.2

COMPARISON OF NPO DIRECTOR RESPONSES WITH EACH OTHER[a]

School District Data	Percent	Desegregation Plan Data	Percent
1. Is school board elected or appointed?	(96)	1. Does district have a desegregation plan?	(96)
2. Are board elections at large or by district?	(89)	2. Original impetus for plan (court order, HEW, voluntary, etc.).	(81)
3. Percentage of district enrollment by ethnicity.	(85)	3. Has court released district from the plan?	(78)
4. Has direct enrollment become more or less minority in the last three years?	(72)	4. Is the plan being challenged in court?	(77)
		5. First year of pupil reassignment (within one year).	(67)
		6. Has pupil reassignment been completed?	(58)
		7. Since the plan was implemented, to what extent have schools become resegregated?	(55)
		8. Does the current plan add to or replace an earlier plan?	(54)

[a]Measured as response consistency between NPO project directors in the same district. Figures in parentheses indicate percentage of responses in complete agreement.

members of the city council; and (3) business and labor leaders. These three levels find clear reflection in the response consistency percentages of Table B.3.

Table B.3

RESPONSE AGREEMENT AMONG NPO PROJECT DIRECTORS ON PUBLIC STATEMENTS ABOUT SCHOOL DESEGREGATION[a]

	Percent
Religious leaders	(74)
Other school board members	(72)
President of the school board	(71)
School superintendent	(63)
Mayor	(60)
City council members	(60)
Labor leaders	(50)
Business leaders	(47)

[a]Figures in parentheses indicate percentage of NPO directors from the same district in complete agreement.